IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	Brandt et al.	Group Art Unit:	2174
Serial No.:	10/058,360	Confirmation No.:	5127
Filed:	January 28, 2002		
For:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DISPLAYING HELP WINDOW SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH WEB PAGE PERTAINING THERETO		

APPEAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF REINSTATED APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant submits herewith an appeal brief in support of its appeal to the Board of Appeals from the decision mailed March 7, 2005, of the Primary Examiner finally rejecting claims 1-8 and 10-29 and the decision mailed January 3, 2006 of the Primary Examiner reopening prosecution.

The appeal brief fee of $500.00 is:

___ Enclosed.

X Not required. (Fee paid in prior appeal.)

___ Charged to Deposit Account No. **09-0465**. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Docket No.: ROC919960172US2
Serial No.: 10/058,360

2

Table of Contents

Docket No.: ROC919960172US2
Serial No.: 10/058,360

1. Real party in interest

The real party in interest is International Business Machines, Inc., the assignee of the above-identified application.

2. Related appeals and interferences

There are no pending appeals or interferences for the above-identified application. However, Appellant filed another appeal brief in this case on November 5, 2005 pursuant to a Notice of Appeal filed August 5, 2005. The Board also reviewed the parent of the above-identified application in a decision dated November 29, 2001 (Appeal No. 1999-1693).

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

3. Status of claims

Claims 1-8 and 10-29 are pending. Claims 1-8 and 10-29 are currently rejected.

Appellant appeals the final rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-29.

4. Status of amendments

Appellant filed a Preliminary Amendment on February 21, 2002 and a Supplemental Preliminary Amendment on June 18, 2003. The Examiner entered both amendments, as indicated in the Office Action mailed July 15, 2004.

Appellant filed an Amendment on June 7, 2005. The Office Action mailed July 27, 2005 indicates that the Examiner did not enter this Amendment. Accordingly, the claims reproduced in Section 8 of this Appeal Brief do not include the June 7, 2005 changes.

Docket No.: ROC919960172US2
Serial No.: 10/058,360

.

5. Summary of claimed subject matter

Claim 1 is directed at a computer with a data storage device including a computer usable medium having computer usable code to present a help window for a web page displayed on a monitor. Claim 1 specifically requires the display of two separate windows: (i) a "web page window" that "includes a web page obtained from a server"; and (ii) a "help window" that "includes user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.* In this way, the present invention presents a world wide web user with instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in a web page without replacing that page in the browser. This feature is highly desirable because a user can perform the acts suggested by the help page while viewing those instructions.

Claim 3 further requires that the help window of claim 1 include "includes a help frame, and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, elements 25 and 29.*

Claim 4 further requires that the help window of claim 3 include "a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, element 30.*

Claim 7 further requires that "the table of contents frame presents hypertext links to hypertext help files pertaining to the web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20.*

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

Claim 8 requires computer readable code to present two separate windows: (i) a "web page window on the monitor" that includes "a web page obtained from a server"; and (ii) a "the help window containing information pertaining to the content of the web page from the server computer and not to the browser, wherein the help information in the help window includes user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

Claim 11 further requires that "the help window includes a help frame, and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, elements 25 and 29.*

Claim 12 further requires that the help window of claim 11 include "includes a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, element 30.*

Claim 13 further requires that the table of contents frame of claim 12 present "hypertext links to hypertext help files pertaining to the web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20.*

Claim 14 is directed at a "computer-implemented method for presenting a help window on the display area of a monitor associated with a user computer along with at least a portion of a web page obtained from a server by a browser." This method requires the display of two separate windows: (i) a "web page in a web page window"; and (ii) "help information in the help window, the help information pertaining to the web page, wherein the information in the help window

Docket No.: ROC919960172US2
Serial No.: 10/058,360

includes instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

Claim 16 further requires "dividing the help window into a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, element 30.*

Claim 17 further requires that "the table of contents frame presents hypertext links to hypertext files pertaining to the web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20.*

Claim 18 further requires "obtaining the help information in a file from the server." *E.g., Summary, page 3, lines 1-3, 13-19, and 27-30; Summary, page 4, lines 5-7 and 17-22; Detailed Description, page 6, lines 16-21; Detailed Description, page 8, lines 3-22; Figure 1, elements 23, 31, and 32.*

Claim 19 also requires the display of two separate windows: (i) a web page window; and (ii) a help window. More specifically, claim 19 requires "a program on the program storage device and including instructions executable to cause the digital processing apparatus to present on a monitor associated with a user computer that executes a browser help information simultaneously with a page obtained by the browser from a server by: presenting a web page from the server on the monitor associated with the user computer; and selectively presenting a help window on the monitor associated with the user computer, the help window containing information pertaining to the web page from the server computer, wherein the information in the help window includes user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

web page." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

Claim 21 further requires the program of claim 19 "cause the digital processing apparatus to present the help window simultaneously on the monitor with at least a portion of the web page." *See Summary, page 2, line 30 - page 2, line 1; page 3, lines 18-19. See also Detailed Description, page 8, lines 27-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

Claim 22 further requires that the program of claim 21 causes "the digital processing apparatus to present in the help window a help frame, and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, elements 25 and 29.*

Claim 23 further requires that the program of claim 22 causes "the digital processing apparatus to present in the help window a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame, the table of contents frame presenting hypertext links to hypertext files pertaining to the web page." *See Summary, page 2, lines 20-26; Detailed Description, page 7, line 11 - page 8, line 20; Figure 2, element 30.*

Claim 24 is directed at a "method of providing help information for a browser site monitor that displays a web site page, the help information containing information relevant to the web site page." This method includes returning two separate web pages to the browser, specifically: (i) a "web site page and computer-executable instructions for displaying a help window containing help information relevant to the requested web site page"; and (ii) a "help web page includ[ing] instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page"

that is "to be displayed in a help window." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

Claim 25 is directed at a method of presenting help information on a browser site monitor that displays a web site page, the help information containing information relevant to the web site page. The method includes the computer-executed step of simultaneously displaying a help window on the browser site monitor with the browser window. The help information in the help window includes instructions how to accomplish functions in the web page. *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

Claim 27 is directed at a "method for presenting a help window on the display area of a monitor associated with a user computer along with at least a portion of an application." This method requires two separate windows, specifically: (i) "displaying an application in an application window"; and (ii) "presenting the help information in the help window," wherein the "help information comprises user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the application." *See Summary, page 3, lines 13-19. See also Detailed Description, page 7, lines 1-13; page 8, lines 23-29. See also Figure 2, elements 24 and 26.*

6. Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal

The Examiner rejected: (i) claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over portions[1] of a document by Jean Marie Deken, dated December 14, 2001 and entitled "The Early World Wide Web at SLAC" ("Deken), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,789,962 to Berry et al. ("Berry"); and (ii) claims 3, 4, 7, 11-13, 16, 17, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Deken in view of Berry and U.S. Patent No. 5,715,415 to Dazey et al ("Dazey").

Appellant requests review of all rejections.

---

[1]The Deken reference does not qualify as prior art under any of the provisions of section 102. Instead, it purports to describe activities at SLAC during 1991-1994. Accordingly, any teaching of Deken beyond its description of those activities cannot be used to support a rejection. Appellants also reserve the right to challenge the timing and facts described therein.

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

7. Argument

Appellant expressly states that the rejected claims do not stand or fall together. For purposes of this renewed Appeal, Group 1 consists of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29; and Group 2 consists of claims 3, 4, 7, 11-13, 16, 17, 22, and 23.

I.   Overview of Invention

A brief overview of Appellant's invention in light of existing art will be helpful in appreciating the issues herein. As described in the Background section, fat-client applications have long allowed users to invoke a help feature by appropriately manipulating a mouse or other input device. *Background, pg. 1, lines 26-28.* When a user invoked this help feature, the application graphics displayed on the monitor were augmented with information pertaining to the operation and/or maintenance of that particular fat-client application. *Id. at lines 28-30.* The user could view the help information simultaneously with the application information to learn more about the application, and then the user can return to the application itself, and cause the monitor to cease displaying the help information. *Background, pg. 2, lines 2-4.* Significantly, however, the scope of this information was related to information about how to operate that particular fat-client application, and not about the information manipulated by and/or displayed in that application. *Summary, pg. 2, lines 23-26.*

The early Internet proceeded down a much different evolutionary path. Early Internet users asked for help regarding the content of the web page by clicking on a hypertext link. *Background, pg. 2, lines 5-6.* The main work area of the web page was then replaced by a separate help page. *Id. at lines 6-7.* After studying the help information, the user hit a "back" button (or a similar navigation mechanism). *Id. at lines 6-7.* This action deleted the help information from the display and replaced it with the original web content. *Id. at lines 7-8.* One

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

problem with this paradigm, however, is that it required the user to remember relevant help information from one page to the next. *Id. at lines 8-10.* Such operation was awkward and extracted a heavy penalty in terms of performance (machine and human) whenever help was required. *Id. at lines 10-12.*

The present invention merges these two paradigms and improves on both. As stated in the Summary section of this Application, a key insight of the present invention is that "it is desirable to provide for use with a web browser a help function that presents help information that pertains, not to the browser application itself, but to information being displayed on a web page obtained by the browser from a server computer." *Summary, page 2, lines 23-26.* Or using more modern terminology, Appellants realized that the web content is the application and should be treated as such. The claimed inventions leverage this insight to provide immediate help for World Wide Web users by presenting the help information simultaneously with the web page to which it pertains, without replacing any part of the web page. *Summary, page 2, lines 19-21.* Conventional Internet help systems, in contrast, simply did not allow one to simultaneously to view both a web page and the help page that pertains to it. *Background, page 2, lines 13-14.*

Let's use a simple example to illustrate the remarkable power of this insight. Before the present invention, a user needing help information relating to a web application would first have to navigate to a help page, then memorize the instructions contained therein, then hit the back button to return to the original web page, then wait for the browser to reload the original web page, then perform the suggested actions, hopefully as directed by the instructions in the help page. For particularly complex applications, the user might have to perform this entire sequence several times. This led to significant usability problems, particularly when coupled with the transmission speeds at which most people accessed the early Internet. *Background, page 2, lines 14-16.* With the present invention, however, that same user is presented simultaneously with the

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

help information and the web page to which it pertains. That user can now easy flip back and forth between the two windows, getting the instructions they need and performing the required actions.

II.   Rejections under § 103

Turning now to rejections under Section 103, it is important to note that the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. *M.P.E.P. § 2142.* To satisfy this burden, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification or combination. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. *M.P.E.P. § 2143.* Examiner's rejections fail to meet the first criteria.

A. Groups 1 and 2: The Examiner is improperly picking and choosing among isolated elements in the prior art to deprecate a significant claim limitation, specifically a separate help window containing including instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in a related web page.

In the realm of user interfaces, it is all too easy to dismiss a new invention as obvious, because a user interface almost always employs well-known devices and features, which are combined in a new and different way. In fact, new user interfaces generally do not provide 'new function'; they simply make it easier for users to do things they can already do using conventional interfaces. But it is just because user interfaces are such a dark science that often a very subtle change in the way information is presented to or obtained from a user can result in a genuine and marked productivity improvement.

The primary reference in the Examiner's most recent round of rejections, Deken, is simply an example of the early-Internet paradigm discussed in Appellant's Background section at

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

page 2, lines 5-12. Deken includes an image of a web page entitled "SPIRES.HTML" from which the user can click on a "help" link. This link caused the terminal to replace the initial, SPIRES.HTML web page with a different web page, entitled "SPIHELP.INDEX." Like the "Webcrawler System" used in the Examiner's previous set of rejections and the art discussed in Applicant's Background section, however, the resulting help information is not displayed in a separate help window. Instead, the system in Deken requires that the user first navigate to a separate help page, then memorize the instructions contained therein, then hit the back button to return to the original page, then wait for the terminal to reload the original page, then perform the suggested actions. In fact, Deken is not designed to utilize multiple windows in any way; all of the information in Deken is presented in the same window. Therefore, Deken fails to "[present the] help information in the help window, the help information pertaining to the web page, wherein the information in the help window includes instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page."

The Examiner's secondary reference, Berry, and terciary reference, Dazey, are examples of the fat-client paradigm discussed in the Background section of this Application at pg. 1, line 26 - pg. 2, line 4. More specifically, Berry describes a method of placing help information in a convenient, but unneeded portion of the screen. Dazey is directed at a method of displaying help content without opening a separate graphical window and without losing focus to the original graphical window. Significantly, however, neither reference contemplates providing help information about the content manipulated by / displayed in the fat-client application. Instead, both references are limited to providing help information about the fat-client applications themselves. Therefore, the secondary and tertiary references also fail to teach or suggest "[presenting the] help information in the help window, the help information pertaining to the web page, wherein the information in the help window includes instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page."

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

The Examiner appears to recognize the inherent problems with these references and attempts to compensate by pulling disparate elements out of each. Thus, the Examiner relies upon Deken to show "help information . . . pertaining to the web page, wherein the information in the help window includes instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page" and Berry to show ". . .presenting help information in the help window. . . ." However, section 103 requires that the focus be on the obviousness of the differences between claimed invention as a whole. *Hybritec, Inc. V. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.* 231, USPQ 81, 93 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The Examiner cannot pick and choose among isolated elements in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Appellant respectfully submits that Examiner's word-by-word reconstruction of its claim limitation is exactly the type of analysis disparaged by the Federal Circuit.

B.   Group 2: The references teach away from the proposed combination.

The Examiner's rejections of the Group 2 claims all rely upon Dazey. Appellant again notes that Dazey teaches:

> Another problem experienced by users is that the separate help window causes loss of focus and attention to the primary window. A window is said to have "focus" when it is active and currently designated to receive the user input from the keyboard or mouse. To navigate in a help window, the help option is activated and focus is transferred from the application window to the help window. *This shift of focus makes it confusing for the user to implement the help instructions. As the user attempts to follow the simple directions for a help topic, the efforts are not effective because the keystrokes referenced in the help window are only valid when the application window has the focus.*

(emphasis added). The cited language, with its characterization of a separate help window as "confusing" and "not effective," teaches directly away from the present invention and its separate help window. The Federal Circuit has held that such "teaching away" is compelling evidence that the claimed inventions are not obvious. E.g., *In re Fine, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).*

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reliance on Dazey is inappropriate and that these rejections should be reversed.

C.   Groups 1 and 2: There is no motivation to make the proposed combinations.

This Application has been pending for a really, really long time. Appellant originally filed the parent application during the very beginnings of the Internet revolution and has submitted a Rule 1.131 Declaration establishing an even earlier priority date. Back in 1996, most people were only vaguely aware the Internet. Those that used it generally did so through 28.8 kbs or 33.6 kbs modems, which required large amounts of time to connect to the Internet and even larger amounts of time to download any web page. This was a time when people were still trying to discover what could be done 'on the Net.' And this question did not have an obvious answer; as the late 90's tech boom indicates, there were many different ideas. And with the benefit of hindsight, we now realize that most of those ideas were laughable. However, one lesson that may be safely drawn from this experience is that many of the techniques commonly used in today's so-called 'Web 2.0' were hardly a simple-matter-of-programming when this invention was conceived.

To protect against the temptation to use hindsight reasoning in long pending cases like this one, the Federal Circuit has repeatedly made clear that the prior suggest the desirability of the combination. *E.g., M.P.E.P. § 2143.01*; *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1599 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Mills*, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Or in other words:

> To imbue one of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the invention in suit, when no prior art reference or references of record convey or suggest that knowledge, is to fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher.
> It is difficult but necessary that the decision maker forget what he or she has been taught . . . about the claimed invention and cast the mind back to the

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

time the invention was made (often as here many years), to occupy of one skilled in the art who is presented with only the references, and who is normally guided by the then-accepted wisdom in the art.

W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 312-13 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *abrogated on other grounds by Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967 (Fed.Cir.1995). The Federal Circuit has further clarified that this "suggestion" must come from the prior art itself. An applicant's own disclosure cannot be used as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention out of isolated teachings of the prior art. *E.g., Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products*, 5 USPQ2d 1788, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

It now becomes necessary to ask, does the prior art suggest the combination proposed by the Examiner? In the most-recent set rejections, the Examiner cites an example of a classic early-Internet help system and an example of a classic fat-client application help system, and then simply states that it would be obvious to combine the two classic paradigms. One problem with this kind of conclusory analysis, however, is that the Examiner fails to identify what in the Deken screenshots would motivate someone to "include a second window to show help on the same screen at the same time" or to "provide the user contextual help which is both relational and positional." In fact, Appellant respectfully submits that reproduced screen-shots fail to suggest any modifications to a help system, much less the claimed inventions. Everything taught by those screen-shots is directed at how to find physics papers, and not at improving methods of presenting help information.

More generally, the Examiner's conclusory analysis implies that he believes this debate is about the existence of the basic building blocks used in the claimed inventions. This is simply incorrect. Appellant has never disputed that the two classic paradigms existed; Appellant discussed both systems in its Background section in great detail. Nor has Appellant ever disputed that the prior art includes windows, panes, lists of objects or tasks, interactive pointers,

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

and so forth. What Appellant does assert, however, that the current invention is more than a mere aggregation of disparate elements. The original Specification explains that what sets the current invention apart is that it "recognizes this it is desirable to provide for use with a web browser a help function that presents help information that pertains, not to the browser application itself, but to information being displayed on a web page obtained by the browser from a server computer." *Summary, pg. 2, lines 23-26*. None of the many references applied against this case over its nearly ten years of prosecution suggest combining the two classic paradigms in this way. This insight is only found in Appellant's Specification. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asserts that the Examiner is engaging in improper hindsight reasoning.

Appellant's position is made even more compelling by the fact that, despite having nearly ten years to search, the Examiner has failed to present **any** integrated web applications designed to simultaneously utilize multiple windows. Appellant believes that this failure alone is compelling evidence that the present invention and its help window were not obvious back in 1996. *In re Hedges*, 228 USPQ 685 (Fed. Cir. 1986)(holding that when the claimed invention is inconsistent with the accepted wisdom, a reference can teach away by merely presenting a suggested mode and not including the claimed mode).

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

8. Claims appendix

1.   A computer with a data storage device including a computer usable medium having computer usable code to present a help window for a web page displayed on a monitor, the computer usable code comprising:

first computer readable code to present a web page window on the monitor, wherein the web page window includes a web page obtained from a server;

second computer readable code to receive a help request from a user for the web page;

third computer readable code to allocate a portion of the monitor for a help window in response to the help request; and

fourth computer readable code to present information to the user in the help window pertaining to the web page, wherein the information includes user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page.

2.   The computer of Claim 1, wherein the help window is displayed simultaneously on the monitor with at least a portion of the web page.

3.   The computer of Claim 1, wherein the help window further includes a help frame, and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto.

4.   The computer of Claim 3, wherein the help window further includes a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame.

5.   The computer of Claim 1, wherein the third and fourth computer readable code means are obtained from the server.

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

6.   The computer of Claim 5, wherein the information in the help window is obtained by the computer in a file from the server.

7.   The computer of Claim 5, wherein the table of contents frame presents hypertext links to hypertext help files pertaining to the web page.

8.   In a user computer connected via a network to a server, the user computer comprising:

a browser to present a web page window on the monitor, wherein the web page window includes a web page obtained from a server; and

computer readable code to present a help window on the monitor in response to a user-generated help request, the help window containing information pertaining to the content of the web page from the server computer and not to the browser, wherein the help information in the help window includes user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page.

9.   [Canceled]

10.   The user computer of Claim 8, wherein the computer readable code presents the help window simultaneously on the monitor with at least a portion of the web page window.

11.   The user computer of Claim 9, wherein the help window includes a help frame, and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto.

12.   The user computer of Claim 11, wherein the help window further includes a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame.

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

13.   The user computer of Claim 12, wherein the table of contents frame presents hypertext links to hypertext help files pertaining to the web page.

14.   A computer-implemented method for presenting a help window on the display area of a monitor associated with a user computer along with at least a portion of a web page obtained from a server by a browser in the user computer via a wide area network, comprising:

downloading the web page from the server;

displaying the web page in a web page window;

receiving a help request for the web page;

in response to the help request, automatically allocating a portion of the display area for a help window; and

presenting help information in the help window, the help information pertaining to the web page, wherein the information in the help window includes instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page.

15.   The method of Claim 14, further comprising:

dividing the help window into a help frame and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto.

16.   The method of Claim 15, further comprising dividing the help window into a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame.

17.   The method of Claim 14, wherein the table of contents frame presents hypertext links to hypertext files pertaining to the web page.

18.   The method of Claim 14, further comprising obtaining the help information in a file from the server.

19.   A computer program device comprising:

a program storage device readable by a digital processing apparatus; and

a program on the program storage device and including instructions executable to cause the digital processing apparatus to present on a monitor associated with a user computer that executes a browser help information simultaneously with a page obtained by the browser from a server by:

    presenting a web page from the server on the monitor associated with the user computer; and

    selectively presenting a help window on the monitor associated with the user computer, the help window containing information pertaining to the web page from the server computer, wherein the information in the help window includes user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page.

20.   The computer program device of Claim 19, wherein the program is further to cause the digital processing apparatus to present the help window in response to a user-generated help signal.

21.   The computer program device of Claim 20, wherein the program is further to cause the digital processing apparatus to present the help window simultaneously on the monitor with at least a portion of the web page.

22. The computer program device of Claim 21, wherein the program is further to cause the digital processing apparatus to present in the help window a help frame, and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame and pertaining thereto.

23. The computer program device of Claim 22, wherein the program is further to cause the digital processing apparatus to present in the help window a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame, the table of contents frame presenting hypertext links to hypertext files pertaining to the web page.

24. A method of providing help information for a browser site monitor that displays a web site page, the help information containing information relevant to the web site page, the method including the server-executed steps of:

receiving from a browser a request for a web site page;

returning to the browser the requested web site page and computer-executable instructions for displaying a help window containing help information relevant to the requested web site page;

receiving from the browser a request for help information to be displayed in a help window corresponding to a function of the web site page; and

returning to the browser a help web page containing the requested information, wherein the help web page includes instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page.

25.   A method of presenting help information on a browser site monitor that displays a web site page, the help information containing information relevant to the web site page, the method including the computer-executed steps of:

providing from a browser site a request to a server for a web site page;

receiving at the browser site the web site page together with computer-executable instructions for automatically displaying a help window containing information relevant to the web site page;

displaying a browser window on a browser site monitor, wherein the browser window contains the web site page;

receiving a help request at the browser site for a function in the web site page;

providing from the browser site a request to the server for help information relevant to the function, wherein the help information in the help window includes instructions how to accomplish functions in the web page;

receiving the help information at the browser site; and

simultaneously displaying a help window on the browser site monitor with the browser window.

26.   The computer of claim 1, further comprising fifth computer readable code to request a help web page from the server in response to the help signal, wherein the help web page includes the help information.

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360

27.   A method for presenting a help window on the display area of a monitor associated with a user computer along with at least a portion of an application, comprising:

    displaying an application in an application window;

    receiving a help request for the application from a user;

    in response to the help request:

        transmitting the help request to an internet server;

        receiving help information from the internet server, wherein help information comprises user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the application;

        automatically allocating a portion of the display area for a help window; and

        presenting the help information in the help window.

28.   The method of Claim 27, wherein the application comprises a web browser; and wherein the application window comprises a web page obtained from the internet server.

29.   The method of Claim 27, wherein the help window comprises a web browser; and wherein the help information comprises a web page containing user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the application.

9. Evidence appendix

N/A

10. Related proceedings appendix

N/A

30

For each of the foregoing reasons, Appellant submits that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-8 and 10-29 were erroneous, and respectfully requests reversal of these decisions.

Date: May 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Grant Johnson
Registration No.: 42,696

From:

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901

Telephone: (507) 253-4660
Fax: (507) 253-2382

Docket No.:   ROC919960172US2
Serial No.:   10/058,360